

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

M-12977 US EXAM	4957
EXAM	IINER
DAHIMENE,	, MAHMOUD
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1765	
-	1765

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/649,099	TANG ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Mahmoud Dahimene	1765

	SUPERVISORY PATENT GRAMMER
	NADINE WORTON SUPERVISORY PATENT GRAMWER
13. 🗀	Other:
	Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).
	See Continuation Sheet.
	<u>IEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
10. 🗀	The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.
	entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
9. 🔲 <sup>.</sup>	The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be
	pecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
3. 🗍 ·	The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>19-23</u> . AVIT OR <u>OTHER EVIDENCE</u>
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 7-12, 16-18, 24-29, 31-35, 38</u> .
(	Claim(s) allowed: <u>3-6.</u> Claim(s) objected to: <u>2,13-15,30,36,37,39 and 40</u> .
	now the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
7. 🛛	For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 🛛 will not be entered, or b) 🔲 will be entered and an explanation of
	non-allowable claim(s).
	Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>3-6</u> would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the
=	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
	NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
(	appear, and/or d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
(	c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
	b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
	a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because
	a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  DMENTS
1	iling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since
	<u>CE OF APPEAL</u> The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of
nay re	duce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
inder 3	7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) a h in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed
ave b	ions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee een filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee
ke	TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN
b) [	
a) [	
	n Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following ime periods:
1	places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)
	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which
	EPLY FILED 08 August 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments regarding the reference of Chen et al. (US 5,661,083) does not teaches "nodules" is not persuasive since the reference of Chen discloses steps corresponding to applicant's claimed step of "(a) providing a chemically reactive, first agent which will react with a first metal element of the metal-containing ARC layer to produce a volatile byproduct,; and (b) subjecting the residue nodules to a plasma including said chemically reactive, first agent", then the formation of nodules (including the first agent being sufficiently small in size to operatively enter reaction zones of the base anchor portions of at least some of the residue nodules so as to react with the first metal element, if any, in the respective base anchor portions) would inherently result. Applicants have not shown a difference in steps between applicants claimed invention and the disclosure of Chen that would not produce such nodules..